

Docket No.: YHK-0115

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



In re Application of

Confirmation No.: 2974

Seong Ho KANG and Sang Jin YUN

Group Art Unit: 2674

Serial No.: 10/632,988

Examiner: Boddie, William

Filed: 8/4/2003

Customer No.: 34610

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DRIVING PLASMA DISPLAY PANEL

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window - Mail Stop AF
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

Applicants request review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this Request. This Request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The review is requested for the reasons(s) stated below (not to exceed five (5) pages):

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious in view of the Awamoto patent taken in combination with the conventional driving method disclosed in Figs. 3 and 5 of Applicants' drawings. This rejection is in error for the following reasons:

1) Claim 1 recites that the "waveform applied in the set-up interval of the first and second driving waveforms are different from each other". This claim further recites that the first and second driving waveforms are applied at different temperatures, i.e., "applying a first driving waveform ... at a first prescribed temperature" and "applying a second driving waveform different ... at a second prescribed temperature." From these recitations, it is therefore clear that claim 1 covers a method for driving a plasma display panel where different waveforms are applied in the set-up interval at different temperatures.

The Awamoto patent does not teach or suggest these features. As described in column 8, lines 10-32, the Awamoto patent discloses changing the number of display pulses during a sustain period in

each sub-field used to drive a plasma display panel. The Examiner relied on this disclosure to provide the features of claim 1 listed above. But, the Examiner's reading of Awamoto is in error because Awamoto makes no modification of the driving waveform in an initialization period or set-up interval at different temperatures. Awamoto only changes the number of pulses in a sustain period, not the waveforms in a set-up period as recited in claim 1. This is evident from column 8, lines 11-15 which disclose that the sustain period TS of each subframe is shortened, but there is no mention in the Awamoto patent of changing a waveform in a set-up interval as recited in claim 1. See also the Request for Reconsideration filed on June 8, 2006, pages 1-4.

Figs. 3 and 5 of Applicants' drawings apply different driving waveforms during a set-up interval of an initialization period. However, these methods have always been used separately from one another. There is no teaching or suggestion in Applicants' specification of commonly applying these waveforms in a same plasma display panel as recited in claim 1. Moreover, neither Figs. 3 and 5, nor corresponding portions of the specification, teach or suggest applying these different waveforms in the set-up interval at different temperatures as is further recited in claim 1.

Based on these omissions, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's §103(a) rejection is in error for failing to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

2) Claim 7 recites that the "waveforms applied in the set-up interval of the first and second driving waveforms are different from each other while waveforms applied in other periods are substantially identical to each other." This claim further recites that the first driving waveform is "supplied when said driving temperature of the panel is a first prescribed temperature ... different from a second driving waveform supplied when the said driving temperature of the panel is a second prescribed temperature." These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. Based on these omissions, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 7 and that therefore the rejection is in error.

3) Claim 11 recites that the “waveforms applied in set-up interval of the first and second driving waveforms are different from each other” and that the controller “differently controls said turning-on and said turning-off of the switching device when a driving temperature is inputted from the temperature sensor is a first prescribed temperature and when a driving temperature inputted from the temperature sensor is a second prescribed temperature, the first and second temperatures being different.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. Based on these omissions, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 11 and that therefore the rejection is in error.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P. O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/SWN:knh
Date: AUGUST 23, 2006
\\Fk4\Documents\2017\2017-103\102848.doc